



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Paul often appeared to him,<sup>1</sup> and that angels of light descended from heaven to converse with him. He further asserted that the powers of darkness assailed him more virulently after these heavenly interviews. "Hark!" he exclaimed, "they are coming! but be not ye alarmed, I will put them to flight. I will rebuke them, and send them back to their accursed abodes. Belial! away! I fear thee not, foul fiend, depart from me! Moloch, fire-demon, return to thine own place: thy burning breath and the flames that issue from thy mouth cannot scorch me! Lucifer, thou art fallen, and I will not be carried with thee to the bottomless pit. Away, prince of this world! I am not Balaam. Do not think that you are to contend for my body. I am not thy prey!"

Martin's horrified visitors were half dead with terror while the saint continued to address and defy one demon after another by name. Sometimes he rushed towards the door as if he were driving the adversary before him, and when he would stand erect and wave his hand with a commanding air, as if that movement would suffice to rid him of the presence of the intruder. It then seemed as if he was exposed to the attack of a new enemy, and that the heathen gods were joining in the conflict. "Mercury," exclaimed the saint, "thinkest thou that I do not know thee under that shape? Thy Proteus form is too familiar to me to be mistaken. Licitious messenger of uncleanness, thou art the most persevering of my foes; but away with thee! And thou, too, once mighty Jove, thinkest thou that thy frowns have any terrors for Martin? Thy reign is over, thy forked lightnings cannot reach me, thy thunderbolts fall harmless at my feet; away to Pandemonium!"<sup>2</sup>

If Vigilantius, as is not improbable, accompanied Sulpicius upon these visits to Marmoutier, and was a witness to any of the scenes just described, it was not likely that he would form a very favourable estimate of the monastic system, which could degrade an earnest and intelligent Bishop like Martin, who had acquired the high honour of being the preacher and apostle of Gaul, to the level of a raving madman.

In the year 394, Vigilantius was sent by Sulpicius into Campania in Italy, as the bearer of a letter addressed to that other friend whose name we have mentioned, St. Paulinus of Nola. In this letter Sulpicius commends the piety of Vigilantius, and mentions the affectionate esteem in which he was held by himself. Paulinus had but lately fixed his residence at Nola. He possessed a reputation for pre-eminent sanctity, and was consulted on all sides as the Christian oracle of Italy; but at this very time he was employing all his wealth and influence to establish the beguiling practice of saint worship, which afterwards became one of the characteristic of the Latin Church, and proved so fatal in the end to the simplicity of the Gospel.

Felix was the name of the saint whom Paulinus delighted to honour. According to the legend, Felix was a Syrian by birth, who, having passed over into Italy, received religious instruction from Maximus, Bishop of Nola, and having been ordained priest in that place, and displayed much zeal in his sacred office, finally perished in the persecution of the Emperor Decius.

When Vigilantius, or any other traveller, arrived at Nola, the inmates of the monastery which Paulinus had founded were naturally ambitious, in honour of their favourite saint, to magnify his supposed favour at the throne of grace, and to tell what astonishing things had been performed through the intercessions of St. Felix. The stranger from Tours would, in his turn, relate the surprising feats of St. Martin, and so the tale went round, until the party was in a state of religious intoxication, and ready to affirm and believe anything, however extravagant and incredible it might be.

We have only room to insert one of these miraculous stories, in which the supernatural interposition of St. Felix was represented to have taken place. We select it, because the historian, Dupin, has pronounced the letter of Paulinus from which the legend is taken to be one of the most interesting that he wrote. The narrative is given so graphically, and with such dramatic effect, that we are sorry our limits oblige us to abridge it.

"A vessel was anchored on the coast of Sardinia, but the violence of a tempest drove her from her moorings, and forced her out to sea. The sailors took to their boat, and made for land, but they were soon all lost. One old man, however, named Victor, was left alone in the ship, and there he remained six days and six nights, at the mercy of the waves, without any food. Tears were his bread, night and day, but he called upon the name of the Lord, and by the help of angels he was enabled to do several things which, in his ignorance and feebleness, it would otherwise have been impossible for him to achieve; he cut down the mast, he baled out the

water, he hoisted and trimmed such sails as could be used. At length he beheld a vision of the angelic host keeping watch, or working for the safety of the ship;—nay, more, he was comforted with the sight of a heavenly being sitting at the helm and steering it; sometimes the celestial helmsman appeared in the person of the Lord, as He is described in the Apocalypse, and sometimes under the form of St. Felix, the patron saint of Paulinus." It is needless to add that Victor and the vessel were eventually saved.<sup>3</sup>

Had any other man, of less renown than Paulinus, attempted to set up altars to the memory of a deceased monk, and to pay almost divine honours in Christian sanctuaries to a human intercessor, he would probably have met with great opposition. But Paulinus was held in such high estimation that the supreme Pontiff of Rome himself could not repress the tide of popular favour; for even when the Pope frowned upon him for some of his irregular proceedings, public opinion loudly testified its admiration, and his gates (as he himself informs Sulpicius) were crowded by monks, clergy, and Bishops, who came to do him honour.

The great error into which Paulinus fell—an error which was probably handed down to him from his Pagan ancestors—consisted in seeking for the intervention of some created being between the soul and its Creator. The worshipper did not approach the eternal throne at once, but he stopped short at the shrine of some imaginary mediator, and here he offered his oblations and his prayers. When he did not find the peace he sought for, or the benefit he desired to obtain, he fancied that his offerings were not accepted in consequence of some omission with regard to the intercessor through whom his prayers had been offered up. He had not decked the altar or the image splendidly enough; he had not made his own character sufficiently conformable to that of the hero or the saint in whose name he implored to be heard. He had not imposed sufferings on himself, such as the object of his veneration had endured. He had not hungered or thirsted, or suffered cold and nakedness, and the extreme of bodily want, in an equal degree; nor had his patience and fortitude been tried by agonies of mind or body equal to those which had been undergone by his patron saints.

Such appears to have been the delusion under which Paulinus laboured. The acts of the saints, as they were handed down in legendary tales of the East and West, and not the precepts of Christ, or the example of the Apostles, were taken for his guidance; and he made Nola his habitation, under the expectation that in imitating the penitential exercises and devotions and self-denial of Felix, the saint of Nola, he should find rest unto his soul. Still, he failed to obtain the self-complacency of which he was in search. He exhausted all the helps to piety of which he had heard or read. He stirred up his devotion by the sight of pictures and images, to remind him how this saint spent years in the desert, and that saint lived weeks and months without eating or drinking. He dug for relics near home, and sent any distance for a rag or a bone, which had the reputation of having belonged to a martyred Christian. He listened to marvellous tales with the most implicit belief. No pretended miracle was too improbable for him; the more astonishing and supernatural the event, the greater its charms for his disordered fancy.

Not content, however, with worshipping St. Felix himself, Paulinus endeavoured to lead others into the same error. First of all, he circulated reports that miracles were performed at the tomb of St. Felix, and that extraordinary cures were vouchsafed to those who prayed at the sepulchre of the saint for his intercession. He next enlarged the oratory dedicated to St. Felix, and established a system of rites and observances, which were Pagan forms of adoration under a Christian name. Processions were formed, the relics of the saint were displayed, incense smoked, and lights burned before his tomb; instances of his miraculous interposition were recounted, votive offerings were presented, and voices exclaiming "Hear us, holy Felix," "Blessed Felix," resounded through the church. Multitudes were attracted from all parts of the country to celebrate the birth-day of Felix, as the most holy anniversary of the year;<sup>4</sup> and when Vigilantius visited Nola, in the year A. D. 395, they assembled in such crowds that there was no counting them. But we must allow Paulinus to describe in his own words the excesses committed on these holy days by the multitudes whom he had thus brought together, and the feeble correctives by which he attempted to restrain them:—

"Oh, that they would offer up their vows of joy with more sobriety, and that they would not be drinking cups of wine within the sacred precincts! You have now reason to dread Felix; you are foolishly

disregarding him; you are insulting him by your drunkenness; you think you are praying to him, while you are convicting yourself of sin. Wretched creature! you are making him the witness and the avenger of your revels."

"I have, therefore, thought it right to have the walls of St. Felix's sanctuary decorated with paintings, that an impression may be made upon the minds of the rustics, by means of pictorial representations; that the figures and the description over them may teach a lesson; that they may think less of the banquet, while they are feasting their eyes with the imagery; that the sacred history and the pious examples which it holds up to view may have a happy influence with them, and that they may forget their wine and become sober."<sup>5</sup>

Paulinus, therefore, introduced paintings of men and animals into his Church at Nola, under the vain hope that pictures could serve as instructors, and teach a purer morality to the peasants who got drunk in honour of St. Felix! It was no wonder that Vigilantius, who was an eye-witness of all these corruptions of Christian truth, was stirred up in his mind, when he contrasted them with the injunctions of the written word of God.

Our readers may remember the anecdote recorded of Epiphanius, who avowed and justified his hasty destruction of a painted curtain hanging before a shrine, because it was ornamented with a picture of Jesus Christ, or of some saint, he cared not which. "I tore it down, and I rent it," said he, "because it presented to view the image of a man in a Church of Christ, contrary to the authority of Scripture."<sup>6</sup> In another passage, speaking of the same profane use of pictures, Epiphanius declared that it was contrary to the Christian religion (*contra religionem nostram*).<sup>7</sup> The letter addressed to John of Jerusalem, from which this account is taken, and in which Epiphanius protested that the use of images and pictures (for he expressly calls the picture of a man an image) is contrary to Scripture, and contrary to the Christian religion, was written in the year A. D. 396. It was the epistle of one Bishop of the Christian Church to another; and yet, almost in the very same year, Paulinus was setting up images and pictures in his church at Nola; and his authority for the practice has ever since been triumphantly appealed to by the Roman Church. So much for the consistency of Romanism; and so much for the unity and the purity of the fourth century, when one saint practised what another condemned!

That pictures and images were first introduced as objects of adoration in Christian Churches, about the close of the fourth century, is highly probable, not only from the language of Epiphanius just quoted, in which he maintains that the practice was contrary to the authority of Scripture and the Church, but also from the explicit testimony of his great contemporary, Augustine. "I know," said that eminent Father, "that there are many worshippers of sepulchres and pictures, and that there are many who feast luxuriously at the graves of the dead. And I mean to show in another volume how vain and pernicious and sacrilegious these practices are. But I admonish you not to reproach the Catholic Church, and to blame her for the practices of men whom she condemns, and is constantly endeavouring to correct, as disobedient sons."<sup>8</sup>

Well would it have been for the Church of Rome if she had followed the sage practice of the Catholic Church in the days of St. Augustine; if she had condemned and corrected the worshippers of pictures and the advocates of saintly intercession, instead of fostering these pernicious corruptions to the utmost of her power!

We have accompanied Vigilantius on his journeys to Gaul and Italy, where he had many opportunities of observing the rise and progress of error in the Christian Church. We have still to follow him to Palestine, to the cell of Jerome at Bethlehem, shortly after which he appears as the uncompromising opponent of these perversions of the true faith of the Gospel of Christ.

#### LIBERALITY OF POPE GREGORY VII.

THE following letter from the famous Pope Gregory VII. appears to us well worthy of being read for the illustration which it affords in respect of two questions concerning the religion and the progress of the Church of Rome.

The first question is concerning the appointment of bishops. The greatest conflict the popes ever had with emperors, and kings, and nations, was about the appointment of bishops.

The second question which this letter illustrates is concerning the claim to exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome.

On both these questions Pope Gregory VII. is well entitled to be heard. We, therefore, give his letter, and we

<sup>1</sup> Petrum etiam et Paulum apostolos videri a se sepius non negavit.—*Ibid.*

<sup>2</sup> St. Martin appears to have had an intimate and extensive acquaintance among the devils, as he could call each of them by his proper name. "Jam vero demones, prout ad eum quisque venisset, suis nominibus increpabat."—Sulp. Dial. ii., c. 14.

<sup>3</sup> It is not wonderful that a solitary recluse, living the life that Martin did, should have uttered the ravings which are here described; but the marvel is, how he could have persuaded any man in his sober senses to believe him. Yet, Sulpicius protests again and again, that, incredible as his narrative may appear, every word of it was true, and that Martin declared he was visited by angels, and assailed by evil spirits.—Dialog. ii. c. 14.

<sup>4</sup> "Ipse enim Dominus nunc suo vultu coruscus, ut in Apocalypsi describitur, et comâ fulgidus; nunc confessoris et amici sui, domini communis patroni Felicis ore venerabilis, in puppi sedebat, sicut nautico uso dicitur ad temones." Paul. epist. ad Macarium, xxxvi., p. 320, ed. Antwerp. A similar tale is told by Reginald, the monk of Durham, who compiled a collection of marvellous stories about St. Cuthbert, in the middle of the twelfth century. "Cuthbert, the saint, appeared in bodily form, and took his seat at the stern of the vessel as steersman. He was richly clothed in pontifical robes, and wore a splendid mitre upon his head. All danger now disappeared. The saint stretched out his pastoral staff over the waves, and the ship glided with the ease of a bird over the boiling and raging billows!"

<sup>5</sup> "Venit facta dies celo, celebrissima terris  
Natalis Felicis agens."

—Paulin. Natal. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Paul. Nat. ix.

<sup>7</sup> Cum ergo hoc vidissem in ecclesia Christi contra auctoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud.—Hieron. Oper. tom. iv. p. 828, ed. Ben.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 829.

<sup>9</sup> Novi multos esse sepulchrorum et picturarum adoratores; novi multos esse qui luxuriosissime super mortuos bibant. . . . Sed et illa quam vana sint, quam noxia, quam sacrilega, et quemadmodum a magna parte vestrum atque adeo pene ab omnibus vobis non observantur, alio volumine ostendere institui. Nunc vos illud admonet, ut aliquando Ecclesie Catholicæ maleficere desinatis, vituperando mores hominum, quos et ipsa condemnat, et quos quotidie tanquam malos filios corrigere studeat.—St. Aug. de Moribus Ecclesie, c. xxxiv.

give it in full, lest we might be accused of omitting anything essential; but printing in italics the parts we intend to discuss; which parts, as we proceed, will assume a more startling aspect than at first sight appears.

The letter was written to Anzir, an African king, and is as follows:—

"Your nobleness has sent your letters to us this year in order that we should ordain Servandus, the presbyter, a bishop, according to the Christian constitution, which, because your request appears just and excellent, we have taken pains to do. Sending us gifts, you have, through reverence for blessed Peter, prince of Apostles, and love to us, dismissed the Christians who were held captive among you, and you have promised that you will dismiss other captives also. In fine, God, the Creator of all, without whom we are not able even to do or to think anything good, has inspired this goodness in your heart. He who illuminates every man that comes into this world has illuminated your mind in this intention. For omnipotent God, who wishes to save all men, and that none should perish; there is nothing which He more approves in us than that man, after loving Him, should love man, and should not do to another what he would not wish to be done to himself. This love, therefore, we and you owe to each other, especially more than to other nations: we who believe and confess one God, though in different ways: we who daily praise and venerate Him as the Creator of ages, and the Ruler of this world. For, as the Apostle says, 'HE IS OUR PEACE WHO HAS MADE BOTH ONE.' But many of the noble Romans, knowing through us this grace given to you by God, entirely admire and proclaim your virtues. Among whom, two of our friends, Albericus and Cincius (brought up with us in the Roman palaces almost from youth itself, greatly desiring to attain to your friendship and love, and to serve you freely in whatever it may please you in our parts), send their men to you, that by them you may understand how prudent and noble they esteem you, and how much they wish and are able freely to serve you. Commending whom to your magnificence, we ask that you will study to render to them, for love of us, and in recompense of the fidelity of the aforesaid men, the same love which we desire always to pay to you and all yours. For God knows that we sincerely love you to the honour of God, and desire your salvation and honour in the present and future life. And that God Himself, after a long period of this life, may lead you into the bosom of blessedness of the holy patriarch, Abraham, we ask with heart and mouth."

Such is the letter of Pope Gregory. The occasion, certainly, was one which required a grateful letter; and it is pleasant to see a pope grateful, especially such a pope as Gregory VII.

But there are principles which a Christian bishop should never surrender, even in the compliments which gratitude suggests. We will now examine how Pope Gregory dealt in this letter with the two questions we have alluded to, viz.:—1. The appointment of Bishops. 2. Exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome.

1. It is clear that this African king kept the nomination of bishops in his own hands. The king chose Servandus to be consecrated a bishop, and the Pope consecrated Servandus accordingly. Yet it was Pope Gregory VII. who fought and won the great battle with the emperor, kings, and princes of Europe about the appointment of bishops. How marvellous that Pope Gregory VII. should have been so submissive to an African prince! We will make that submission more marvellous still before we have done.

2. With respect to the second question—exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome—Pope Gregory VII. clearly points out that some religious difference existed between him and the African king to whom he wrote. He says:—"We who believe and confess one God, though in different ways." Clearly there was some religious difference between them, which the Pope could not altogether overlook, and yet that difference did not prevent the Pope writing in language of mutual brotherhood and love.

Truly the Pope was right when he said that nothing is more pleasing to God than that next to the love of God we should love man too, and Pope Gregory seems to think that mere love to man should be founded on, or at least be strengthened by, our knowledge of God. For he says that he and this African king should have a greater love to each other than the Pope could have with other nations: why? Because, he says, "we believe and confess one God;" and "He is our peace who has made both one." And Pope Gregory does not think that lesser differences in religion or in worship should prevent such happy consequences following from the great truths concerning God in which we all agree; for he says this mutual love and kindness should follow from our acknowledging one God, even "though in different ways."

Happy would it have been if popes had always made due allowance for those who differed from them in some things, while acknowledging and worshipping the same God. Alas, it is sad how little disposed men are (even popes) to inculcate love on account of things in which we agree, instead of hatred on account of things in which we differ.

We can imagine now our Protestant readers exclaiming in astonishment at our taking such lessons as these from Pope Gregory VII. What! (they will say), from

Hildebrand! from Pope Gregory VII.; that great firebrand of the Church and of the earth; the man who first put the interests of Rome and her supremacy in conflict with every interest of love and peace and harmony among men, and destroyed the peace of the world then and forever, to exalt the spiritual power of his Church upon the ruins of love and charity among men! Our Protestant readers, no doubt, do regard Pope Gregory VII. in this light; and in their surprise they will ask, "Is the editor of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN gone mad to take his text from Pope Gregory VII. to preach love and harmony between those who differ in worshipping one God in different ways? Or has the whole Protestant world (and a great part of the Roman Catholic world too) been wrong in the views they have formed of the ruthless policy and objects of Hildebrand—Pope Gregory VII.?"

Now, the Editor is not mad. There is Pope Gregory's letter, and it is our duty to draw lessons from it. We also know how seldom popular notions of history do adequately represent the facts of past times. The editor, therefore, ventures to form original views of his own from original documents, and draws his lessons accordingly; and with the impartiality which should govern his conduct, cares not one straw whose prejudice he may shock, whether they be Protestants or Roman Catholics.

We cannot remove surprise at this letter of Pope Gregory VII. We can only increase the astonishment both of Protestants and Roman Catholics.

We hold that love should exist and be cultivated in spite of religious differences. We hold, too, that religious differences are not unimportant; and that such differences may be of the highest importance, and may involve duties of the highest obligation. St. Paul thought so when he exclaimed, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel."

In considering religious differences, we must consider their nature, that we may not so overlook them as to cease from preaching the Gospel. Much as we admire the general sentiments of Pope Gregory's letter, we cannot subscribe to his method of applying them in this instance; at least, we must first examine what the religious difference was in this case.

A difference there was:—"We believe and confess one God, though in different ways." What was the difference, and how broad was it, between the Pope and the African king.

One thing strikes us as strange, and, perhaps, has struck our readers as strange too, in this letter of the Pope, and that thing is—there is no mention of Christ, and no allusion to Christ, in this letter of the Pope!

Was it "a forget" in the Pope? Alas, no! The Pope wanted to be very civil, and it would have been very rude to have mentioned Christ in this letter!

For this African king did not believe in Christ! He was not a Christian! He was a Mahometan!!!

The Saracens had conquered Africa; the Saracens were then the kings and princes of Africa; and the Saracens were Mahometans. A handful of Saracens invaded and conquered a country. They could not exterminate all the Christian inhabitants; they had to rule them; and, therefore, "the Christian dogs," on payment of tribute, were allowed the exercise of their religion. But the Saracen princes, like the Turkish sultans afterwards, kept in their own hands the nomination of bishops for their Christian subjects. Pope Gregory VII., who convulsed all Europe sooner than leave the nomination of bishops, as it had been before, with Christian princes, quietly submitted to have Christian bishops nominated by Mahometan kings in Africa, because the Saracens were there the ruling power, and would have "stood no nonsense" on the subject.

But viewing that African king as a Mahometan, the "liberality" of Pope Gregory VII. is enough to make both Protestants and Roman Catholics stand aghast.

The letter not only does not mention Christ, but it carefully speaks of God in Mahometan language, and not in Christian language. God is described as "God, the Creator of all;" "The Creator of ages, and the Ruler of this world;" but never as "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."

That a Pope (and such a Pope) should write to a Mahometan that God had inspired his heart, and enlightened his mind, and that they were worshipping one God, "though in different ways;" and to apply to that "one God" whom Mahometans worship, as proving the union of Christians and Mahometans, the words which Scripture applies to Christ alone—"He is our peace who has made both one;" and to found on this his hopes, and almost his assurance, of salvation, in the rejection of Christ: such liberality as this, we think, amounts to a denial of the Gospel of Christ.

Leaving all judgment to God, and not presuming what his judgment will be, or ought to be, concerning Mahometans, we yet hold that that "liberality" which sets aside the preaching of the Gospel is spurious and false.

From those who so set aside and deny the Gospel we never expect to find that true liberality which the Gospel teaches. It would be a miracle, indeed, if the Pope who thus threw over the faith of Christ to flatter a Mahometan king should ever have shown any sympathy, or kindness, or charity towards any Christians believing in Christ who showed any spirit of insubordination to the Church of Rome. If any Roman Catholic can point out to us any one of the multitudinous letters of Pope Gregory VII. which inculcated liberality towards fellow Christians who declined implicit obedience to Rome, we shall be happy to

print it. But we never heard Pope Gregory accused of anything of the kind.

The lesson we now draw from it is this: popes, and bishops, and priests do not themselves believe in the doctrine (as commonly understood) of exclusive salvation in the Church of Rome. But they do consider that doctrine as a very useful means of exercising power and influence over all who can be brought to believe it. They use it with the people; they explain it away in theological discussion; they profess the utmost liberality in this respect, when it suits their purpose; they practically treat it as an instrument of power, and not as an article of faith.

Some of our readers may be shrewd enough to have observed that those priests who most countenance and promote the notion that all Protestant heretics will be damned, are ever the loudest in promising God's favour, and heaven itself, to every Protestant squire or lord who will give land, or money, or hold a plate at a collection in chapel. In all such cases in future let our readers call to mind the authority given for such liberality of the priests in the letter of Pope Gregory VII. to the MAHOMETAN KING.

## PRACTICES OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH WITH RESPECT TO THE EUCHARIST—No. II.

WE purpose in the present article to continue an attempt which we commenced in our last number, to judge of the doctrine of the ancient Church by her practices, and to examine whether those practices were consistent with a belief in transubstantiation. Our object is to inquire did the ancient Church merely treat the consecrated elements with that reverence which is due to them as the appointed means by which the faithful are made partakers of the body and blood of our blessed Lord, or did she act as if she believed that under the appearance of bread and wine the body, soul, and divinity of our Redeemer were locally resident on thousands of altars on earth, not so much to be partaken of by the people as to be the great object of their adoration. We can tell how she would have acted if she had believed in transubstantiation, because we know what the practices are into which this belief has led the modern Church of Rome. If we find the practices of the ancient Church to be totally different, may we not conclude with certainty that her faith was not the same.

We need not repeat the several points of difference on which we dwelt in our last article, but merely recal to our readers' recollection the last point on which we were contrasting the practices of the ancient and modern Church. The Church of Rome, thinking as she does concerning what is contained under the appearance of bread and wine, takes the greatest possible care to guard so sacred a treasure from the least possible danger of profanation. She entrusts the charge of it to none but her priests, and allows it to be preserved nowhere except on the altars of her temples. The ancient Church, on the other hand, knew nothing of such precautions, but allowed all Christians, men and women, to carry the consecrated elements home with them, where they looked it up in their boxes, and sometimes applied it to uses which no one now would consider seemly. We were speaking last of those who made up the consecrated elements into cataplasms, and we have now to mention a usage repugnant to the feelings even of a Protestant, but which, to one who believed in transubstantiation, must have been impossible, namely, the employment of the consecrated wine as ink for writing with. Yet, three remarkable instances can be produced of a pope, a general council, and a king who did so. The first is of Pope Theodorus, who, as Theophanes relates (see Baronius, A.D. 648, sec. 14), when Pyrrhus the Monothelite departed from Rome, and as came to Ravenna, and returned like a dog to his vomit, "and when this was found out, Pope Theodorus, calling a full congregation of the Church, came to the sepulchre of the head of the Apostles, and asking for the divine cup, he dropped some of the life-giving blood into the ink, and so with his own hand made the deposition of excommunicated Pyrrhus!" The next instance is the doing of the same in the condemnation and deposition of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, by the Fathers of the fourth Council of Constantinople (which Roman Catholics call the eighth general council), on which occasion (see Labbe, tom. viii., p. 1231) the bishops subscribed, not with bare ink, but, dipping their pen in the very blood of our Saviour, condemned and deposed Photius. The last example is that of a peace or agreement made between Charles the Bold and Bernard, Count of Barcelona, which is said to have been confirmed and signed *Sanguine Eucharistico*—with the blood of the Eucharist.

Examples like these throw light on the language of the writers of the time, and show that when, according to their usual custom, they give to the consecrated elements the names of the things which they represent, and speak of them familiarly as the body and blood of Christ, they did not then use the words in their highest and proper sense; since it is hard to believe that if the Christians then thought them in this sense entitled to these names they would have subjected them to the profanations of which we have given instances.

We shall next mention another usage equally irreconcilable with a belief in transubstantiation—the burial of the Eucharist with dead bodies. Thus, we are told in the life of St. Basil that he kept a portion of the Eucharist to be buried with him, and left it to be so by his